arXiv:1003.2322v1 [math.DG] 11 Mar 2010

HOMOLOGICALLY MAXIMIZING GEODESICS IN CONFORMALLY FLAT TORI

STEFAN SUHR

Abstract. We study homologically maximizing timelike geodesics in conformally flat tori. A causal geodesic γ in such a torus is said to be homologically maximizing if one (hence every) lift of γ to the universal cover is arclength maximizing. First we prove a compactness result for homologically maximizing timelike geodesics. This yields the Lipschitz continuity of the time separation of the universal cover on strict sub-cones of the cone of future pointing vectors. Then we introduce the stable time separation $\mathfrak{l}$. As an application we prove relations between the concavity properties of $\mathfrak{l}$ and the qualitative behavior of homologically maximizing geodesics.

1. Introduction

Here, we present a version of Mather theory for maximizing geodesics on conformally flat Lorentzian tori. More general Lorentzian manifolds will be treated in [1]. The source for the techniques we employ are [2] and [3].

Consider a real vector space V of dimension $m < \infty$ and $\langle .,. \rangle_1$ a nondegenerate symmetric bilinear form on V with signature $(-,+,\dots,+)$. Set $|.|_1 := \sqrt{|\langle .,. \rangle_1|}$. Further let $\Gamma \subseteq V$ be a co-compact lattice and $f\colon V \to (0,\infty)$ a smooth Γ-invariant function. The Lorentzian metric $\overline{g} := f^2\langle .,. \rangle_1$ then descends to a Lorentzian metric on the torus V/Γ. Denote the induced Lorentzian metric by g. Choose a time-orientation of $(V, \langle .,. \rangle_1)$. This time-orientation induces a time-orientation on $(V/\Gamma, g)$ as well. Note that $(V/\Gamma, g)$ is vicious ([4] p. 137) and the universal cover $(V, \overline{g})$ is globally hyperbolic ([4] p. 65). According to [5] proposition 2.1, $(V/\Gamma, g)$ is geodesically complete in all three causal senses. Fix a norm $\|.\|$ on V and denote the dual norm by $\|.\|^*$. We define $B_r(x) := \{y \in V |\ \|y - x\| < r\}$. Note that $\|.\|$ induces a metric on V/Γ. For a subset $A \subseteq V$ we write $\operatorname{dist}(x, A)$ to denote the distance of the point $x \in V$ to A relative to $\|.\|$. Further denote by $\mathfrak{T}$ the positive oriented causal vectors of $(V, \langle .,. \rangle_1)$, i.e. the vectors $v \in V \setminus \{0\}$ with $\langle v, v \rangle_1 \leq 0$ and positive time-oriented. For $\varepsilon > 0$ set $\mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon := \{v \in \mathfrak{T} |\ \operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq \varepsilon\|v\|\}$.

Let I be any (bounded or unbounded) interval in the reals. A causal geodesics $\gamma\colon I \to V/\Gamma$ of $(V/\Gamma, g)$ is said to be homologically maximizing if one (hence every) lift $\overline{\gamma}\colon I \to V$ is arclength maximizing in $(V, \overline{g})$ (for simplicity we will only consider future pointing curves) in the following sense: For every compact subinterval $[a, b] \subseteq I$ the curve $\gamma|_{[a,b]}$ is arclength maximizing among all causal curves connecting $\gamma(a)$ to $\gamma(b)$. In section 2 we will prove a compactness result for homologically maximizing timelike geodesics. Using this compactness result we will then deduce the Lipschitz continuity of the time separation of $(V, \overline{g})$ on

Date: March 12, 2010.

$\{(x,y) \in V \times V \,|\, y - x \in \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon\}$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$. Here we use the term time separation as a synonym for the Lorentzian distance function ([4] definition 4.1).

In section 3 we show the existence of the stable version of the time separation d of $(V, \overline{g})$, i.e. $\mathfrak{l}(v) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{d(x,x+nv)}{n}$ exists for all $x \in V$ and $v \in \mathfrak{T}$ and is independent of x. We will call $\mathfrak{l}$ the *stable time separation* of $(V/\Gamma, g)$. Futhermore for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a constant $K(\varepsilon) < \infty$ such that $|d(x, x+v) - \mathfrak{l}(v)| \leq K(\varepsilon)$ for all $x \in V$ and $v \in \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$. The stable time separation constitutes the Lorentzian version of the stable norm on $H_1(M, \mathbb{R})$ of a compact Riemannian manifold (M, g_R). The strategy of deduction we follow is taken from [2]. Even in the Riemannian case, the mentioned estimate on $|d(x, x+v) - \mathfrak{l}(v)|$ is not obvious.

In section 4 we relate concavity properties of $\mathfrak{l}$ to the existence and the asymptotic properties of homologically maximizing geodesics. More precisely, we show that for any homologically maximizing geodesic $\gamma\colon \mathbb{R} \to V/\Gamma$ there exists a support function α of $\mathfrak{l}$ such that all accumulation points of sequences of rotation vectors of subarcs of γ lie in the intersection $\alpha^{-1}(1) \cap \mathfrak{l}^{-1}(1)$. Conversely, for any support function α of $\mathfrak{l}$ we can find a homologically maximizing timelike geodesic such that the limits of rotation vectors of γ lie in $\alpha^{-1}(1) \cap \mathfrak{l}^{-1}(1)$. As a corollary we obtain the existence of infinitely many geometrically distinct homologically maximizing timelike geodesics in $(V/\Gamma, g)$.

Acknowledgement: I would like to thank Prof. V. Bangert for the excellent support in the preparation of my diploma thesis, out of which these notes have arisen.

2. Compactness Theorems

For a curve $\gamma\colon I \to V/\Gamma$ and $s, t \in I$ set $\gamma(t) - \gamma(s) := \overline{\gamma}(t) - \overline{\gamma}(s)$, where $\overline{\gamma}\colon I \to V$ is any lift of γ. Obviously, this definition does not depend on the chosen lift $\overline{\gamma}$.

Definition 2.1. (i) Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $G < \infty$. A causal curve $\gamma\colon I \to V/\Gamma$ is said to be (G, ε)-timelike if there exist $a, b \in I$ such that $\gamma(b) - \gamma(a) \in \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$ and $\|\gamma(b) - \gamma(a)\| \geq G$.

(ii) Let $F < \infty$. A causal curve $\gamma\colon I \to V/\Gamma$ is said to be F-almost maximal if

$$L^g(\gamma|_{[s,t]}) \geq d(\overline{\gamma}(s), \overline{\gamma}(t)) - F$$

for one (hence every) lift $\overline{\gamma}$ of γ to V and all $[s,t] \subseteq I$.

Proposition 2.2. *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $F < \infty$ there exist constants $\delta > 0$ and $0 < K < \infty$ such that for all $G < \infty$, all F-almost maximal (G, ε)-timelike curves $\gamma\colon I \to V/\Gamma$ and all $s < t \in I$ with $\|\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)\| \geq K$ we have*

$$\gamma(t) - \gamma(s) \in \mathfrak{T}_\delta.$$

Before giving the proof of proposition 2.2 we review some applications.

Choose a orthonormal basis $\{e_1, \ldots, e_m\}$ of $(V, \langle ., . \rangle_1)$. Note that the translations $x \mapsto x + v$ are conformal diffeomorphisms of $(V, \overline{g})$ for all $v \in V$. Then the $\overline{g}$-orthogonal frame field $x \mapsto (x, (e_1, \ldots, e_m))$ on V descends to a g-orthogonal frame field on V/Γ. In this way it makes sense to speak of a tangent vector $w \in T(V/\Gamma)$ as belonging to $\mathfrak{T}$ or $\mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon > 0$.

Theorem 2.3. *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for all future pointing homologically maximizing geodesics $\gamma\colon I \to V/\Gamma$ with $\dot{\gamma}(t_0) \in \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$ for some $t_0 \in I$,*

we have

$$\dot\gamma(t) \in \mathfrak{T}_\delta$$

for all $t \in I$.

Theorem 2.3 is a direct consequence of proposition 2.2 together with the continuity of the geodesic flow and the invariance of the set of lightlike vectors under the geodesic flow. This has the following immediate consequence.

Corollary 2.4. *Let* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and* $G < \infty$. *Then any limit curve of a sequence of homologically maximizing* (G,ε)*-timelike curves in* $(V/\Gamma, g)$ *is timelike.*

Note that limit curves are understood in the sense of the limit curve lemma ([4] lemma 14.2). The corollary resembles the *generalized timelike co-ray condition* in [6]. It requires that any co-ray to a given timelike ray is again timelike. Following [7] it was proved in [6] that the generalized timelike co-ray condition implies the Lipschitz continuity of the Busemann function associated to a given timelike ray. The same proof (with some obvious modifications) works in the present situation as well.

Theorem 2.5. *For all* $\varepsilon > 0$ *there exists an* $L = L(\varepsilon) < \infty$ *such that the time separation* d *of* $(V, \overline{g})$ *is* L*-Lipschitz on* $\{(x,y) \in V \times V \,|\, y - x \in \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon\}$.

Now we proceed to the proof of proposition 2.2.

First note the following fact. There exist constants $c > 0$ and $C < \infty$ such that

$$c\|w\| \operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T}) \le |\langle v, w\rangle_1| \text{ and } |v|_1^2 \le C\|v\| \operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T}) \tag{2.1}$$

for all $v, w \in \mathfrak{T}$.

Since $\langle .,. \rangle_1$ is non-degenerate there exist constants $c' > 0$ and $C' < \infty$ with

$$c'\|v\| \le \|\langle v, .\rangle_1\|^* \le C'\|v\|$$

for all $v \in V$. For the first inequality in (2.1) note that for every $w \in \mathfrak{T}$ the orthogonal complement of w relative to $\langle .,. \rangle_1$, denoted by $w^\perp$, is a spacelike hyperplane. Since $\langle .,. \rangle_1$ is non-degenerate, we have $\operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T}) \le \operatorname{dist}(v, w^\perp)$ for every $v \in \mathfrak{T}$. Consider for $v \in V$ a $v_0 \in w^\perp$ with $\|v - v_0\| = \operatorname{dist}(v, w^\perp)$. Note that we have

$$|\langle v - v_0, w\rangle_1| = \|v - v_0\| \, \|\langle ., w\rangle_1\|^*.$$

Consequently we get

$$|\langle v, w\rangle_1| = |\langle v_0 - v, w\rangle_1| \ge c'\|w\| \, \|v - v_0\| = c'\|w\| \operatorname{dist}(v, w^\perp).$$

Next consider a $v_1 \in \partial\mathfrak{T}$ with $\|v - v_1\| = \operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T})$. Note that $\|v_1\| \le 2\|v\|$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\langle v, v\rangle_1 &= -\langle v, v\rangle_1 + \langle v_1, v_1\rangle_1 = -2\int_0^1 \langle (1-t)v_1 + tv, v - v_1\rangle_1 dt \\ &\le 2C' \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \|(1-t)v_1 + tv\| \|v - v_1\| \le 4C'\|v\| \, \|v - v_1\| \\ &=: C\|v\| \operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathfrak{T}$ contains no linear subspaces we can choose $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\|\sum v_i\| \ge \eta \sum \|v_i\| \tag{2.2}$$

for any finite set $\{v_i\}_{1\le i\le N} \subset \mathfrak{T}$. Note that this implies that we have

$$L^{\|.\|}(\gamma) \ge \eta\|\gamma(b) - \gamma(a)\| \tag{2.3}$$

for any future pointing curve $\gamma\colon [a,b] \to V/\Gamma$.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\varepsilon, \lambda_0 > 0$. Then there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $\{v_i\}_{1\leq i\leq N} \subseteq \mathfrak{T}$ with $\sum v_i \in \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$ and $\sum |v_i|_1 \geq \lambda_0 |\sum v_i|_1$ there exists $j \in \{1,\dots,N\}$ with $v_j \in \mathfrak{T}_{\varepsilon_0}$.*

Proof. Assume that for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ there exist $\{v_i^n\}_{1\leq i\leq N(n)} \subseteq \mathfrak{T}$ with $\sum v_i^n \in \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$ and $v_i^n \notin \mathfrak{T}_{\frac{1}{n}}$. With (2.1) and (2.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \lambda_0\sqrt{c\varepsilon}\left\|\sum v_i\right\| &\leq \lambda_0\left|\sum v_i^n\right|_1 \\ &\leq \sum |v_i^n|_1 \leq \sqrt{\frac{C}{n}}\sum \|v_i^n\| \leq \frac{1}{\eta}\sqrt{\frac{C}{n}}\left\|\sum v_i\right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently we get $0 < \lambda_0\sqrt{c\varepsilon} \leq \frac{1}{\eta}\sqrt{\frac{C}{n}} \to 0$ for $n \to \infty$. □

Lemma 2.7. *$v \in \mathfrak{T} \mapsto \operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T})$ is a concave function.*

Proof. We prove that the superlevels $\operatorname{dist}^{-1}(.,\partial\mathfrak{T})([r,\infty))$ are convex for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$.

Fix $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $v, w \in \operatorname{dist}^{-1}(.,\partial\mathfrak{T})([r,\infty))$. For $\lambda \in [0,1]$ set $A_\lambda := B_r((1-\lambda)v + \lambda w)$. We claim that

$$\cup_{\lambda\in[0,1]} A_\lambda = \operatorname{conv}(A_0 \cup A_1), \tag{2.4}$$

where $\operatorname{conv}(A_0 \cup A_1)$ denotes the convex hull of $A_0 \cup A_1$. Let $x \in \operatorname{conv}(A_0 \cup A_1)$. With the theorem of Caratheodory we can choose $x_0,\dots,x_m \in A_0 \cup A_1$ and $\lambda^0,\dots,\lambda^m \geq 0$ with $\sum \lambda^i = 1$ and $x = \sum \lambda^i x_i$. By relabeling the x_i we can assume that $x_0,\dots,x_j \in A_0$ and $x_{j+1},\dots,x_m \in A_1$. Then we have

$$x_v := \sum_{k=0}^{j} \lambda^k (x_k - v), x_w := \sum_{l=j+1}^{m} \lambda^l (x_l - w) \in B_r(0).$$

Set $\lambda := \sum_{k=0}^{j} \lambda^k$. We get $x_v + x_w = x - \lambda v - (1-\lambda)w$. Since $\|x_v + x_w\| \leq r$ we have $x \in A_\lambda$. Therefore we get $\operatorname{conv}(A_0 \cup A_1) \subseteq \cup A_\lambda$.

For the other inclusion let $y \in \cup A_\lambda$. Choose $\lambda_y \in [0,1]$ with $y \in A_{\lambda_y}$. Define

$$y_v := y + \lambda_y(v - w) \text{ and } y_w := y + (1-\lambda_y)(w - v).$$

We have $y_v \in A_0$, $y_w \in A_1$ and $y \in \operatorname{conv}(\{y_v, y_w\})$. This shows (2.4).

Since

$$\cup A_\lambda = \operatorname{conv}(A_0 \cup A_1) \subset \operatorname{conv}(\mathfrak{T} \cup \mathfrak{T}) = \mathfrak{T}$$

we have $\operatorname{dist}(\lambda v + (1-\lambda)w, \partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq r$ for all $\lambda \in [0,1]$. This implies the convexity of $\operatorname{dist}^{-1}(.,\partial\mathfrak{T})([r,\infty))$. □

Note that $v \in \mathfrak{T} \mapsto \operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T})$ is positively homogenous of degree one, i.e. we have $\operatorname{dist}(\lambda v, \partial\mathfrak{T}) = \lambda \operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T})$ for all $\lambda \geq 0$.

Lemma 2.7 and the positive homogeneity imply

$$\operatorname{dist}(v + w, \partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq \operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T}) + \operatorname{dist}(w, \partial\mathfrak{T}). \tag{2.5}$$

Corollary 2.8. *The cones $\mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$ are convex for all $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Proof. For $v, w \in \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{dist}(v + w, \partial\mathfrak{T}) &\geq \operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T}) + \operatorname{dist}(w, \partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq \varepsilon(\|v\| + \|w\|) \\ &\geq \varepsilon\|v + w\|. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\lambda_1 < \infty$ and set $\mu := \frac{c\,\eta}{4\lambda_1^2 C}$. Then we have*

$$|v+w|_1 \geq \lambda_1(|v|_1 + |w|_1)$$

for all $v, w \in \mathfrak{T}$ with $\|v\| \leq \mu\|w\|$ and $\operatorname{dist}(w, \partial\mathfrak{T}) \leq \mu \operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T})$.

Proof. Using (2.1), (2.5) and (2.2) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|v+w|_1 &\geq \sqrt{c \operatorname{dist}(v+w, \partial\mathfrak{T})\|v+w\|} \geq \sqrt{c\,\eta \operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T})\|w\|} \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{c\,\eta}}{2}\left(\sqrt{\operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T})\|w\|} + \sqrt{\operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T})\|w\|}\right) \\
&\geq \lambda_1\sqrt{C}(\sqrt{c \operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T})\|v\|} + \sqrt{c \operatorname{dist}(w, \partial\mathfrak{T})\|w\|}) \geq \lambda_1(|v|_1 + |w|_1).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Note that the time separation d of $(V, \overline{g})$ satisfies

$$\inf f\,|v|_1 \leq d(x, x+v) \leq \sup f\,|v|_1$$

for all $v \in \mathfrak{T}$ and $x \in V$.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\kappa', F' < \infty$ and $\varepsilon' > 0$ be given. Then there exists $K' := K'(\kappa', F', \varepsilon') < \infty$ such that for all $G' < \infty$ and all future pointing (G', ε')-timelike F'-almost maximal curves $\gamma\colon [s,t] \to V/\Gamma$ with $\|\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)\| \geq K'$, we have*

$$\operatorname{dist}(\gamma(t) - \gamma(s), \partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq \kappa'.$$

Proof. Assume that the claim is false. Then there exist $\kappa', F' < \infty$, $\varepsilon' > 0$, a sequence $G'_n < \infty$ and a sequence of (G'_n, ε')-timelike and F'-almost maximal curves $\gamma_n\colon [s_n, t_n] \to V/\Gamma$ with

$$\|\gamma_n(t_n) - \gamma_n(s_n)\| \geq n \text{ and } \operatorname{dist}(\gamma_n(t_n) - \gamma_n(s_n), \partial\mathfrak{T}) \leq \kappa'.$$

Choose $[a_n, b_n] \subseteq [s_n, t_n]$ with $\|\gamma(b_n) - \gamma(a_n)\| \geq G'_n$ and $\gamma(b_n) - \gamma(a_n) \in \mathfrak{T}_{\varepsilon'}$. If $\varepsilon'\|\gamma(b_n) - \gamma(a_n)\| > \kappa'$ the contradiction is obvious. We have

$$\operatorname{dist}(\gamma(b_n) - \gamma(a_n), \partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq \varepsilon'\|\gamma(b_n) - \gamma(a_n)\| > \kappa'.$$

Since $\operatorname{dist}(\gamma(t_n) - \gamma(s_n), \partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq \operatorname{dist}(\gamma(b_n) - \gamma(a_n), \partial\mathfrak{T})$, we get $\operatorname{dist}(\gamma(t_n) - \gamma(s_n), \partial\mathfrak{T}) > \kappa'$.

Therefore we can assume that $\varepsilon' G'_n \leq \varepsilon'\|\gamma(b_n) - \gamma(a_n)\| \leq \kappa'$. Note that we can further assume that $G'_n = \varepsilon'$, since we have $\|\gamma(b_n) - \gamma(a_n)\| \geq \operatorname{dist}(\gamma(b_n) - \gamma(a_n), \partial\mathfrak{T})$.

First we consider the case that $\|\gamma_n(t_n) - \gamma_n(a_n)\|$ is unbounded. We can pass to a subsequence and assume that $\|\gamma_n(t_n) - \gamma_n(a_n)\| \to \infty$. We can assume that γ_n is parameterized by $\|.\|$-arclength. With (2.3) we know that $L^{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma_n|_{[a_n, t_n]}) = t_n - a_n \to \infty$ for $n \to \infty$. By shifting the parameter we can assume that $a_n \equiv 0$.

According to the limit-curve lemma there exists a subsequence of $\{\gamma_n|_{[0,t_n]}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converging uniformly on compact sets to a future pointing curve $\gamma_\infty\colon [0, \infty) \to V/\Gamma$. It is classical that γ_∞ is F'-almost maximal as well ([4] proposition 14.3). The fact that there exists a $T_0 \geq 0$ with

$$\|\gamma_\infty(T_0) - \gamma_\infty(0)\| \in \left[\varepsilon', \frac{\kappa'}{\varepsilon'}\right] \text{ and } \gamma_\infty(T_0) - \gamma_\infty(0) \in \mathfrak{T}_{\varepsilon'}$$

is ensured by the uniform convergence and the continuity of the functions $v \mapsto \|v\|$ and $v \mapsto \operatorname{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T})$. With the same argument we get that

$$\operatorname{dist}(\gamma_\infty(T) - \gamma_\infty(0), \partial\mathfrak{T}) \leq \kappa'$$

for all $T \geq 0$.

Set $\lambda_1 := \frac{2 \sup f}{\inf f}$ and $\mu := \frac{c\,\eta}{4\lambda_1^2 C}$. Choose $T_1 > T_0$ such that we have

$$\operatorname{dist}(\gamma_\infty(T) - \gamma_\infty(T_1), \partial\mathfrak{T}) \leq \mu\, \varepsilon'^2 \leq \mu \operatorname{dist}(\gamma_\infty(T_1) - \gamma_\infty(0), \partial\mathfrak{T})$$

for all $T > T_1$. Further choose $T_2 > T_1$ with

$$\|\gamma_\infty(T_2) - \gamma_\infty(T_1)\| \geq \mu \|\gamma_\infty(T_1) - \gamma_\infty(0)\|$$

and

$$\|\gamma_\infty(T_2) - \gamma_\infty(0)\| \geq \frac{4F'^2}{c\,\varepsilon'^2 \inf f^2} + 1. \tag{2.6}$$

On the one hand we get

$$\frac{\inf f}{2} |\gamma_\infty(T_2) - \gamma_\infty(0)|_1 \geq \sup f (|\gamma_\infty(T_2) - \gamma_\infty(T_1)|_1 + |\gamma_\infty(T_1) - \gamma_\infty(0)|_1)$$

with lemma 2.9. On the other hand, using (2.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf f |\gamma_\infty(T_2) - \gamma_\infty(0)|_1 &\geq \inf f \sqrt{c \operatorname{dist}(\gamma_\infty(T_2) - \gamma_\infty(0), \partial\mathfrak{T}) \|\gamma_\infty(T_2) - \gamma_\infty(0)\|} \\
&\geq \inf f \sqrt{c \operatorname{dist}(\gamma_\infty(T_0) - \gamma_\infty(0), \partial\mathfrak{T}) \|\gamma_\infty(T_2) - \gamma_\infty(0)\|} \\
&\geq \inf f\, \varepsilon' \sqrt{c\, \|\gamma_\infty(T_2) - \gamma_\infty(0)\|} > 2F'.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we get

$$\begin{aligned}
L^g(\gamma_\infty|_{[0,T_2]}) &\geq \inf f |\gamma_\infty(T_2) - \gamma_\infty(0)|_1 - F' \\
&> \frac{\inf f}{2} |\gamma_\infty(T_2) - \gamma_\infty(0)|_1 \\
&\geq \sup f (|\gamma_\infty(T_2) - \gamma_\infty(T_1)|_1 + |\gamma_\infty(T_1) - \gamma_\infty(0)|_1) \\
&\geq L^g(\gamma_\infty|_{[0,T_1]}) + L^g(\gamma_\infty|_{[T_1,T_2]}).
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently the sequence $\|\gamma_n(t_n) - \gamma_n(a_n)\|$ has to be bounded.

In the other case $\|\gamma_n(b_n) - \gamma_n(s_n)\| \to \infty$, we obtain an analogous contradiction. Since

$$\|\gamma_n(t_n) - \gamma_n(s_n)\| \leq \|\gamma_n(b_n) - \gamma_n(s_n)\| + \|\gamma_n(t_n) - \gamma_n(a_n)\|,$$

we have a contradiction to the assumption that $\|\gamma_n(t_n) - \gamma_n(s_n)\| \to \infty$ for $n \to \infty$. This finishes the proof. □

Denote by

$$\operatorname{diam}(\Gamma, \|.\|) := \frac{1}{2} \inf \left\{ \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \|k_i\| \,|\, \langle k_1, \ldots, k_m \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}} = \Gamma \right\},$$

where $\langle k_1, \ldots, k_m \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}$ denotes the $\mathbb{Z}$-span of $k_1, \ldots, k_m \in \Gamma$. Since Γ is a co-compact lattice there exists for all $x, y \in V$ a $l_{x,y} \in \Gamma$ with

$$\|x - (y + l_{x,y})\| \leq \operatorname{diam}(\Gamma, \|.\|).$$

Lemma 2.11. *There exists* $\mathrm{D} < \infty$ *such that for all* $x, y \in V$ *there exists* $k_{x,y} \in \Gamma$ *with* $\|x - (y + k_{x,y})\| \leq \mathrm{D}$ *and* $y + k_{x,y} \in x + \mathfrak{T}$.

Proof. Choose $v \in \mathfrak{T} \setminus \partial\mathfrak{T}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that we have $B_\varepsilon(v) \subseteq \mathfrak{T}$. Since $\mathfrak{T}$ is a cone we have $B_{\lambda\varepsilon}(\lambda v) \subseteq \mathfrak{T}$ for all $\lambda \geq 0$. Choose $\frac{\operatorname{diam}(\Gamma, \|.\|)}{\varepsilon} < \Lambda < \infty$. Then we have $B_{\operatorname{diam}(\Gamma, \|.\|)}(\Lambda v) \subseteq \mathfrak{T}$. Set $k_{x,y} := l_{x+\Lambda v, y}$ and $\mathrm{D} := \operatorname{diam}(\Gamma, \|.\|) + \Lambda \|v\|$. □

Proof of proposition 2.2. Let $F, G < \infty$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\gamma\colon I \to V/\Gamma$ be a F-almost maximal (G,ε)-timelike curve.

(i) Choose $[a',b'] \subseteq I$ with $\|\gamma(b')-\gamma(a')\| \geq G$ and $\gamma(b')-\gamma(a') \in \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$. Set $G_0 := \max\left\{\frac{2F}{\sqrt{c\,\varepsilon}\inf f}, \varepsilon\right\}$. If $G \geq G_0$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\inf f|\gamma(b')-\gamma(a')|_1 &\geq \inf f\sqrt{c\,\mathrm{dist}(\gamma(b')-\gamma(a'),\partial\mathfrak{T})\|\gamma(b')-\gamma(a')\|}\\ &\geq \inf f\sqrt{c\,\varepsilon}\,\|\gamma(b')-\gamma(a')\| \geq \inf f\sqrt{c\,\varepsilon}\,G \geq 2F.\end{aligned}$$

For any partition $\{\gamma|_{[a_i,b_i]}\}_{1\leq i\leq N}$ of $\gamma|_{[a',b']}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sup f\sum|\gamma(b_i)-\gamma(a_i)|_1 &\geq \sum L^g(\gamma|_{[a_i,b_i]}) = L^g(\gamma|_{[a',b']})\\ &\geq \inf f|\gamma(b')-\gamma(a')|_1 - F\\ &\geq \frac{\inf f}{2}|\gamma(b')-\gamma(a')|_1.\end{aligned}$$

Apply lemma 2.6 to $v_i := \gamma(b_i)-\gamma(a_i)$ with $\lambda_0 := \frac{\inf f}{2\sup f}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ as above. Consequently there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $[a,b] \subseteq [a',b']$ with $\|\gamma(b)-\gamma(a)\| \in [\varepsilon, 2G_0]$ (note that $\mathrm{dist}(v,\partial\mathfrak{T}) \leq \|v\|$ for all $v \in \mathfrak{T}$) and $\gamma(b)-\gamma(a) \in \mathfrak{T}_{\varepsilon_0}$.

(ii) Let $s < a < b < t \in I$. If $\|\gamma(b)-\gamma(s)\| \geq \nu := \frac{4(F+1)^2}{\inf f^2 c\,\varepsilon_0\varepsilon}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\inf f|\gamma(b)-\gamma(s)|_1 &\geq \inf f\sqrt{c\,\mathrm{dist}(\gamma(b)-\gamma(s),\partial\mathfrak{T})\|\gamma(b)-\gamma(s)\|}\\ &\geq \inf f\sqrt{c\,\varepsilon_0\varepsilon\|\gamma(b)-\gamma(s)\|} \geq 2(F+1).\end{aligned}$$

Consequently we have

$$\sup f(|\gamma(a)-\gamma(s)|_1 + |\gamma(b)-\gamma(a)|_1) > \frac{\inf f}{2}|\gamma(b)-\gamma(s)|_1.$$

Set $\lambda_1 := \frac{2\sup f}{\inf f}$. Recall the definition of $\mu := \frac{c\,\eta}{4\lambda_1^2 C}$. If $\|\gamma(a)-\gamma(s)\| \geq \mu\,(2G_0)$ we get

$$\mathrm{dist}(\gamma(a)-\gamma(s),\partial\mathfrak{T}) > \mu\,\mathrm{dist}(\gamma(b)-\gamma(a),\partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq \mu\,\varepsilon_0\varepsilon$$

with lemma 2.9. Note that we have

$$\|\gamma(a)-\gamma(s)\| \geq \|\gamma(b)-\gamma(s)\| - \|\gamma(b)-\gamma(a)\| \geq \nu - 2G_0.$$

Consequently we get that if

$$\sup_{s'\in I,\, s'<a}\|\gamma(b)-\gamma(s')\| \geq \max\{\nu-2G_0, 2\mu\,G_0\} := H_0$$

there exists $s \in I$, $s < a$ with

$$\|\gamma(a)-\gamma(s)\| = H_0 \text{ and } \gamma(a)-\gamma(s) \in \mathfrak{T}_{\delta_0}$$

for $\delta_0 := \frac{\mu\,\varepsilon_0\varepsilon}{H_0}$. In the same way we obtain the existence of a parameter $t \in I$, $t > b$ with $\|\gamma(t)-\gamma(b)\| = H_0$ and $\gamma(t)-\gamma(b) \in \mathfrak{T}_{\delta_0}$, if we have that $\sup_{t'\in I,\, t'>b}\|\gamma(t')-\gamma(b)\| \geq H_0$.

(iii) Define $\kappa' := 3\,\mathrm{D}$, $G' := 2\mu\,G_0$, $F' := F$ and $\varepsilon' := \delta_0$ and $K_0 := K'(3\,\mathrm{D}, 2\mu G_0, F, \delta_0)$, according to lemma 2.10. Then there exists $\tau \in I$, $b < \tau$ with

$$\|\gamma(\tau)-\gamma(b)\| = K_0 \text{ and } \mathrm{dist}(\gamma(\tau)-\gamma(b),\partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq 3\,\mathrm{D}$$

if $\sup_{t'\in I,\, t'>b}\|\gamma(t')-\gamma(b)\| \geq K_0$. Analogously, if we have $\sup_{s'\in I,\, s'<a}\|\gamma(a)-\gamma(s')\| \geq K_0$, there exists $\sigma \in I$, $\sigma < a$ with

$$\|\gamma(a)-\gamma(\sigma)\| = K_0 \text{ and } \mathrm{dist}(\gamma(a)-\gamma(\sigma),\partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq 3\,\mathrm{D}\,.$$

We saw in step (ii) that for intervals $[b,t] \subseteq I$ with $\|\gamma(t)-\gamma(b)\| = H_0$ we have

$$\gamma(t)-\gamma(b) \in \mathfrak{T}_{\delta_0}.$$

We will carry this over to all intervals $[s,t] \subset I$ with $\|\gamma(t)-\gamma(s)\|$ sufficiently large via the following cut-and-paste argument.

Note first that it suffices to consider the case $\sup_{t'\in I,\, t'>b} \|\gamma(t')-\gamma(b)\| \geq K_0$. The case $\sup_{s'\in I,\, s'<a} \|\gamma(a)-\gamma(s')\| \geq K_0$ can be reduced to the former by considering $\gamma_{\mathrm{inv}}(t) := \gamma(-t)$ and the opposite time-orientation on $(V/\Gamma, g)$.

Therefore we can assume that $\sup_{t'\in I,\, t'>b} \|\gamma(t')-\gamma(b)\| \geq K_0$. Choose $\tau \in I$, $b<\tau$ with $\|\gamma(\tau)-\gamma(b)\| = K_0$. We have $\operatorname{dist}(\gamma(\tau)-\gamma(b), \partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq 3\,\mathrm{D}$. Let $[s,t] \subset I$ be an interval mutually disjoint to $[a,\tau]$. We can choose future pointing curves $\zeta_i \colon [a_i,b_i] \to V/\Gamma$ $(i=1,\ldots,6)$ with $L^{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta_{1,2,4,5}) \leq \mathrm{D}$ such that

$$\gamma' := \gamma|_{[a,b]} * \zeta_1 * \gamma|_{[s,t]} * \zeta_2 * \gamma|_{[\tau,s]} * \zeta_3$$

is future pointing and homotopic with fixed endpoints to $\gamma|_{[a,t]}$ if $s \geq \tau$ and such that

$$\gamma'' := \gamma|_{[s,t]} * \zeta_4 * \gamma|_{[a,b]} * \zeta_5 * \gamma|_{[t,a]} * \zeta_6$$

is future pointing and homotopic with fixed endpoints to $\gamma|_{[s,\tau]}$ if $t \leq a$.

This can be seen as follows: Assume first that $s \geq \tau$. Choose future pointing curves ζ_1, ζ_2 with $L^{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta_i) \leq \mathrm{D}$ connecting $\gamma(b)$ with $\gamma(s)$ and $\gamma(t)$ with $\gamma(\tau)$. Now consider a lift $\overline{\gamma}$ of γ to V and a lift $\overline{\xi}_1$ of $\zeta_1 * \gamma|_{[s,t]} * \zeta_2 * \gamma|_{[\tau,s]}$ starting at $\overline{\gamma}(b)$. Let q be the terminal point of $\overline{\xi}_1$. Then we have

$$\overline{\gamma}(t) - q = [\gamma(\tau)-\gamma(t)] + \sum_{i=1}^{2} [\zeta_i(b_i)-\zeta_i(a_i)].$$

By construction we have $\| \sum_{i=1}^{2} [\zeta_i(b_i)-\zeta_i(a_i)] \| \leq 2\,\mathrm{D}$. Since $\operatorname{dist}(\gamma(\tau)-\gamma(t), \partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq 3\,\mathrm{D}$ we get $\overline{\gamma}(t)-q \in \mathfrak{T}$. Choose a future pointing curve $\zeta_3 \colon [a_3,b_3] \to V/\Gamma$ with $\zeta_3(a_3) = \gamma(s)$ and $\zeta_3(b_3)-\zeta_3(a_3) = \overline{\gamma}(t)-q$. This completes the construction of γ'.

If $t \leq a$ choose future pointing curves ζ_4, ζ_5 with $L^{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta_{4,5}) \leq \mathrm{D}$ connecting $\gamma(t)$ with $\gamma(a)$ and $\gamma(b)$ with $\gamma(t)$. Consider a lift $\overline{\gamma}$ of γ to V and a lift $\overline{\xi}_2$ of $\zeta_4 * \gamma|_{[a,b]} * \zeta_5 * \gamma|_{[t,a]}$ starting at $\overline{\gamma}(t)$. Let q be the terminal point of $\overline{\xi}_2$. Then we have

$$\overline{\gamma}(\tau) - q = [\gamma(\tau)-\gamma(b)] + \sum_{i=4}^{5} [\zeta_i(b_i)-\zeta_i(a_i)].$$

By construction we have $\| \sum_{i=4}^{5} [\zeta_i(b_i)-\zeta_i(a_i)] \| \leq 2\,\mathrm{D}$. Since $\operatorname{dist}(\gamma(\tau)-\gamma(b), \partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq 3\,\mathrm{D}$ we get $\overline{\gamma}(\tau)-q \in \mathfrak{T}$. Choose a futurepointing curve $\zeta_6 \colon [a_6,b_6] \to V/\Gamma$ with $\zeta_6(a_6) = \gamma(a)$ and $\zeta_6(b_6)-\zeta_6(a_6) = \overline{\gamma}(\tau)-q$.

Set $F_0 := F + \sup f\sqrt{C}K_0$. We claim that γ' and γ'' are F_0-almost maximal. Indeed we have

$$\begin{aligned} L^g(\gamma') \geq L^g(\gamma|_{[a,t]}) - L^g(\gamma|_{[b,\tau]}) &\geq d(\overline{\gamma}(a),\overline{\gamma}(t)) - L^g(\gamma|_{[b,\tau]}) - F \\ &\geq d(\overline{\gamma}(a),\overline{\gamma}(t)) - (F + \sup f\sqrt{C}K_0). \end{aligned}$$

Analogously we get $L^g(\gamma') \geq d(\overline{\gamma}(s),\overline{\gamma}(\tau)) - (F + \sup f\sqrt{C}K_0)$.

Set $v := [\gamma(b) - \gamma(a)] + [\zeta_1(b_1) - \zeta_1(a_1)]$ and $w := \gamma(t) - \gamma(s)$. Note that we have $\|v\| \leq 2G_0 + \mathrm{D}$ and $\mathrm{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq \varepsilon_0\varepsilon$. If $\|v + w\| \geq \frac{4(F_0+1)^2}{\inf f^2 c\, \varepsilon_0\varepsilon}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\inf f|v + w|_1 &\geq \inf f\sqrt{c\,\mathrm{dist}(v + w, \partial\mathfrak{T})\|v + w\|} \\ &\geq \inf f\sqrt{c\,\varepsilon_0\varepsilon\|v + w\|} \geq 2(F_0 + 1).\end{aligned}$$

Consequently we have

$$\sup f(|v|_1 + |w|_1) > \frac{\inf f}{2}|v + w|_1.$$

Set $\lambda_1 := \frac{2\sup f}{\inf f}$. Recall the definition of $\mu := \frac{c\,\eta}{4\lambda_1^2 C}$. If $\|w\| \geq \mu\,(2G_0 + \mathrm{D})$ we get

$$\mathrm{dist}(w, \partial\mathfrak{T}) > \mu\,\mathrm{dist}(v, \partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq \mu\,\varepsilon_0\varepsilon$$

with lemma 2.9.

Set

$$K := \frac{4}{\eta}\max\left\{\mu(2G_0 + \mathrm{D}), \frac{4(F_0 + 1)^2}{\inf f^2 c\,\varepsilon_0\varepsilon}, G_0 + K_0\right\}.$$

Let $[s, t] \subset I$ with $\|\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)\| \geq K$. We want to show that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\gamma(t) - \gamma(s) \in \mathfrak{T}_\delta$. If $\|\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)\| \geq 2K$ we can partition $[s, t]$ into mutually disjoint subintervals $[s_i, t_i]$ with $\|\gamma(t_i) - \gamma(s_i)\| \in [K, 2K]$. If we have $\gamma(t_i) - \gamma(s_i) \in \mathfrak{T}_\delta$ for all i and some $\delta > 0$, we get $\gamma(t) - \gamma(s) \in \mathfrak{T}_\delta$, using corollary 2.8. Therefore we can assume that $\|\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)\| \in [K, 2K]$. If we have $[s, t] \setminus (a, \tau_0) = \emptyset$, we are done since we can then apply the above cut-and paste argument and obtain $\mathrm{dist}(\gamma(t) - \gamma(s), \partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq \mu\varepsilon_0\varepsilon$. Then we have

$$\gamma(t) - \gamma(s) \in \mathfrak{T}_{\delta'}$$

for $\delta' := \frac{\mu\varepsilon_0\varepsilon}{2K}$.

If we have $[s, t] \setminus (a, \tau_0) \neq \emptyset$, then $[s, a]$ or $[\tau, t] \neq \emptyset$. By the choice of K, we have

$$\max\{\|\gamma(a) - \gamma(s)\|, \|\gamma(t) - \gamma(\tau)\|\} \geq \frac{1}{\eta}\max\left\{\mu(2G_0 + \mathrm{D}), \frac{4(F_0 + 1)^2}{\inf f^2 c\,\varepsilon_0\varepsilon}\right\}.$$

Recall that we have $\gamma(b) - \gamma(a) \in \mathfrak{T}_{\varepsilon_0}$ and $\gamma(\tau_0) - \gamma(b) \in \mathfrak{T}_{\varepsilon'}$ for $\varepsilon' := \frac{3\,\mathrm{D}}{K_0}$. Again with the above cut-and-paste argument we obtain

$$\gamma(t) - \gamma(\tau) \text{ or } \gamma(a) - \gamma(s) \in \mathfrak{T}_{\delta''} \tag{2.7}$$

for $\delta'' := \min\{\delta', \varepsilon_0, \varepsilon'\}$. Note the following fact. Let $v, w \in \mathfrak{T}$ with $\|w\| \leq \|v\|$ and $v \in \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$. Then we have $v + w \in \mathfrak{T}_{\varepsilon/2}$. Combining this with (2.7) we get

$$\gamma(t) - \gamma(s) \in \mathfrak{T}_\delta,$$

for $\delta := \frac{1}{2}\delta''$. This finishes the proof. □

3. The Stable Time Separation

Proposition 3.1. *There exists a positively homogenous concave function* $\mathfrak{l}\colon \mathfrak{T} \to [0, \infty)$ *such that:*

1. *For every* $\varepsilon > 0$ *there exists a* $K(\varepsilon) > 0$ *such that*
$$|\mathfrak{l}(v) - d(x, x + v)| \leq K(\varepsilon)$$
for all $v \in \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$ *and all* $x \in V$.
2. $\inf f|v|_1 \leq \mathfrak{l}(v) \leq \sup f|v|_1$ *for all* $v \in \mathfrak{T}$.
3. $\mathfrak{l}(v + w) \geq \mathfrak{l}(v) + \mathfrak{l}(w)$ *for all* $v, w \in \mathfrak{T}$.

The following lemma is an adapted version of lemma 1 in [2].

Lemma 3.2. *Let $K < \infty$ and $f\colon [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ be a L-Lipschitz continuous function such that*

(1) $f(2t) - 2f(t) \leq K$,
(2) $zf(t) - f(zt) \leq K$ *for* $z = 2, 3$

and all $t \geq 0$. Then there exists an $a \in \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$|f(t) - at| \leq 2K,$$

for all $t \geq 0$.

Proof. We have

$$z^n f(t) \leq f(z^n t) + K \sum_{k=1}^{n} z^k$$

for all $t \geq 0$, $z = 2, 3$ and integers $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. This implies

$$\frac{f(t)}{t} \leq \frac{f(z^n t)}{z^n t} + \frac{2K}{t}.$$

From $f(t) \leq Lt + f(0)$ we get the existence of $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{f(z^n t)}{z^n t} =: a_z(t)$. Choose for $\varepsilon > 0$ an integer $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\frac{f(z^r t)}{z^r t} \geq a_z(t) - \varepsilon$ and $\frac{2K}{z^r t} \leq \varepsilon$. Then we have

$$\frac{f(z^{n+r}t)}{z^{n+r}t} \geq \frac{f(z^r t)}{z^r t} - \frac{2K}{z^r t} \geq a_z(t) - 2\varepsilon$$

for all $n \geq 0$. Therefore the sequence $\left\{\frac{f(z^n t)}{z^n t}\right\}_n$ converges to $a_z(t)$.

We claim that $a_z(t)$ is independent of $t \geq 0$ and $z = 2, 3$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{f(2^n t)}{2^n t} - \frac{f(3^m s)}{3^m s}\right| &\leq \left|\frac{f(2^n t)}{2^n t} - \frac{f(3^m s)}{2^n t}\right| + \left|\frac{f(3^m s)}{2^n t} - \frac{f(3^m s)}{3^m s}\right| \\ &\leq L\frac{|2^n t - 3^m s|}{2^n t} + \frac{|2^n t - 3^m s|}{2^n t}\frac{f(3^m s)}{3^m s}\end{aligned}$$

for all $s, t \geq 0$. Since $\liminf_{m,n\to\infty} \frac{|2^n t - 3^m s|}{2^n t} = 0$ we get $a_2(t) = a_3(s) =: a$.

Define $f(t) - at =: \delta(t)$. Then we get

$$|f(2^n t) - 2^n(at + \delta(t))| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{n} 2^k K \leq 2^{n+1} K$$

and

$$\left|\frac{f(2^n t)}{2^n t} - \left(a + \frac{\delta(t)}{t}\right)\right| < \frac{2K}{t}.$$

Passing to the limit $n \to \infty$, we obtain the lemma. □

Lemma 3.3. *For all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $K' = K'(\varepsilon) < \infty$ such that*

$$d(x, x + zv) \geq z d(x, x + v) - K'$$

for $z = 2, 3$ and all $x, v \in V$ with $v \in \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$.

Proof. Recall the definition of $\operatorname{diam}(\Gamma, \|.\|)$. Choose $l \in \Gamma$ with $x+l \in B_{\operatorname{diam}(\Gamma,\|.\|)}(x+v)$. Using theorem 2.5 we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, x+2v) &\geq d(x, x+v) + d(x+v, x+2v) \\ &\geq d(x, x+v) + d(x+l, x+l+v) - 2L(\varepsilon)\|v-l\| \\ &= 2d(x, x+v) - 2L(\varepsilon)\operatorname{diam}(\Gamma, \|.\|). \end{aligned}$$

The other case follows analogously. □

Lemma 3.4 ([2], lemma 2)**.** *Let $\overline{\gamma}\colon [a,b] \to V$ be a continuous curve. Then there exist $k \leq [m/2]$ and k-many mutually disjoint closed subintervals $[s_i, t_i]_{1\leq i\leq k} \subseteq [a,b]$ with*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} [\overline{\gamma}(t_i) - \overline{\gamma}(s_i)] = \frac{1}{2}[\overline{\gamma}(b) - \overline{\gamma}(a)].$$

Lemma 3.5. *For all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $K'' = K''(\varepsilon) < \infty$ such that*

$$2d(x, x+v) \geq d(x, x+2v) - K''$$

for all $x, v \in V$ with $v \in \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$.

Proof. The idea is to build an almost maximal curve between x and a point near $x+v$ from pieces of a maximal curve between x and $x+2v$. By increasing K'', we can assume $\|v\| \geq (2m+1)\,\mathrm{D}$. Let $\overline{\gamma}\colon [a,b] \to V$ be a maximal curve from x to $x+2v$. Choose intervals $[s_i, t_i] \subset [a,b]$ as in lemma 3.4. Next choose points $\overline{\gamma}(s_i)^*$ and $\overline{\gamma}(t_i)^*$ in the Γ-orbit of x such that $\overline{\gamma}(s_i)^* \in (\overline{\gamma}(s_i) + \mathfrak{T}) \cap B_{\mathrm{D}}(\overline{\gamma}(s_i))$ and $\overline{\gamma}(t_i)^* \in (\overline{\gamma}(t_i) + \mathfrak{T}) \cap B_{\mathrm{D}}(\overline{\gamma}(t_i))$. Applying the transformations in Γ that map $\overline{\gamma}(s_i)^*$ to $\overline{\gamma}(t_{i-1})^*$, resp. $\overline{\gamma}(s_1)^*$ to x, yields:

$$d(x, x+v+\sum[\overline{\gamma}(s_i)^* - \overline{\gamma}(s_i)] + [\overline{\gamma}(t_i)^* - \overline{\gamma}(t_i)]) \geq \sum d(\overline{\gamma}(s_i), \overline{\gamma}(t_i))$$

We have $v + \sum[\overline{\gamma}(s_i)^* - \overline{\gamma}(s_i)] + [\overline{\gamma}(t_i)^* - \overline{\gamma}(t_i)] \in \mathfrak{T}_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}$ since we have assumed $\|v\| \geq (2m+1)\,\mathrm{D}$. With the Lipschitz continuity of the time separation on $\mathfrak{T}_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} &d(x, x+v+\sum[\overline{\gamma}(s_i)^* - \overline{\gamma}(s_i)] + [\overline{\gamma}(t_i)^* - \overline{\gamma}(t_i)]) \\ &\quad\leq d(x, x+v) + L(\varepsilon/2)\sum \operatorname{dist}(\overline{\gamma}(s_i), \overline{\gamma}(s_i)^*) + \operatorname{dist}(\overline{\gamma}(t_i), \overline{\gamma}(t_i)^*) \\ &\quad\leq d(x, x+v) + mL(\varepsilon/2)\,\mathrm{D}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Since we can repeat the argument with $\overline{\gamma}|_{[s_i,t_i]}$ replaced by $\overline{\gamma}|_{[t_{i-1},s_i]}$ we get after summing of the results:

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, x+2v) &= \sum d(\overline{\gamma}(s_i), \overline{\gamma}(t_i)) + d(\overline{\gamma}(t_{i-1}), \overline{\gamma}(s_i)) \\ &\leq 2d(x, x+v) + 2mL(\varepsilon/2)\,\mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of proposition 3.1. Lemma 3.5 and 3.3 ensure that lemma 3.2 can be applied to $f_x(t) := d(x, x+tv)$. Then there exists an $a_x(v)$ with $|d(x, x+tv) - a_x(v)t| \leq 2\max\{K', K''\} =: K$. In fact $a_x(v)$ does not depend on x since for $x' \in V$ we have

$$\left|\frac{d(x', x'+nv)}{n} - a_x(v)\right| \leq \frac{K + 2L(\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{D}}{n}.$$

This shows the independence of $a_x(v)$ of x as well as the uniform convergence on compact subsets of $\mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$ of $\frac{1}{n}d(x,x+nv)$ to $a_x(v)$. Set $\mathfrak{l}(v) := a_x(v)$. The estimate (1) then follows from the definition. Property (2) follows directly from the estimate:

$$\inf f|v|_1 \leq d(x,x+v) \leq \sup f|v|_1$$

The inverse triangle inequality follows readily from the inverse triangle inequality for the time separation. For the positive homogeneity note that by the uniform convergence on compact subsets of $\mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$ it suffices to consider rational factors $\eta = \frac{p}{q}$. Then by considering subsequences we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{l}(\eta v) &= \lim \frac{1}{n} d(x, x+\frac{p}{q}nv) = \lim \frac{1}{qn} d(x, x+pnv)\\ &= \lim \frac{p}{qn} d(x,x+nv) = \frac{p}{q}\lim \frac{1}{n} d(x,x+nv) = \eta \mathfrak{l}(v).\end{aligned}$$

□

4. The Rotation Vector

Define the rotation vector of a future pointing curve $\gamma\colon [a,b] \to V/\Gamma$:

$$\rho(\gamma) := \frac{1}{\mathfrak{l}(\gamma(b)-\gamma(a))}[\gamma(b)-\gamma(a)]$$

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\gamma\colon \mathbb{R} \to V/\Gamma$ be a homologically maximizing geodesic with $\dot\gamma(t_0) \in \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$ for some $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there exists a support function α of $\mathfrak{l}$ such that for all neighborhoods U of $\alpha^{-1}(1) \cap \mathfrak{l}^{-1}(1)$ there exists a $K = K(\varepsilon, U) > 0$ such that for all $s < t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\|\gamma(t)-\gamma(s)\| \geq K$, we have*

$$\rho(\gamma|_{[s,t]}) \in U.$$

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$, $F, G < \infty$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be given. Then there exists a $K = K(\varepsilon, \delta, F, G, n) < \infty$ such that for all $k \leq n$, all $T \geq K$ and all F-almost maximal (G,ε)-timelike curves $\gamma\colon \mathbb{R} \to V$, the following holds.*

Given k many intervals $[t_i, t_i+\sigma_i]$ with disjoint interiors and $L^g(\gamma|_{[t_i,t_i+\sigma_i]}) = T$ we have

$$\mathfrak{l}(\sum \rho(\gamma|_{[t_i,t_i+\sigma_i]})) \leq k+1+\delta.$$

Proof. Assume that the arcs $\gamma|_{[t_i,t_i+\sigma_i]}$ are indexed in increasing order. W.l.o.g. we can suppose that $\|\gamma(t_i+\sigma_i) - \gamma(t_{i+1})\| \leq \mathrm{D}$. If this is not the case we can repeat the "cut-and-paste" operation from the proof of proposition 2.2. Choose $\delta > 0$ according to theorem 2.3. Notice that in this case for any interval $[s_\infty, t_\infty]$ with $\|\gamma(t_\infty)-\gamma(s_\infty)\| = (2n-1)\frac{\mathrm{D}}{\delta}$, we have $\operatorname{dist}(\gamma(t_\infty)-\gamma(s_\infty), \partial\mathfrak{T}) \geq (2n-1)\,\mathrm{D}$. Choose one such interval disjoint from $[t_i, t_i+\sigma_i]$. The new curve, resulting from the cut-and-paste operation, will be $L^g(\gamma|_{[s_\infty,t_\infty]})$ − F-almost maximal. Define $A := \max L^g(\gamma|_{[t_i+\sigma_i,t_{i+1}]})$.

Now let $\mathfrak{T}'$ be a proper sub-cone of $\mathfrak{T}$, $v_i \in \mathfrak{T}'$ $(0 \leq i \leq k)$ with $\mathfrak{l}(v_i) = 1$ and $\mathfrak{l}(\sum v_i) = k+1+r$. Further let $\lambda_i > 0$ and $\lambda \leq \min \lambda_i$. Then

$$\mathfrak{l}(\sum \lambda_i v_i) \geq \lambda \mathfrak{l}(\sum v_i) + \sum \mathfrak{l}((\lambda_i-\lambda)v_i) \geq \lambda(k+1+r)$$

and for $\lambda_i = \mathfrak{l}(\gamma(t_i+\sigma_i)-\gamma(t_i))$

$$\mathfrak{l}(\sum \gamma(t_i+\sigma_i)-\gamma(t_i)) \geq \lambda \mathfrak{l}(\sum \rho(\gamma|_{[t_i,t_i+\sigma_i]})).$$

By proposition 3.1 there exists a $K < \infty$, depending only on F, G and ε, such that $|\mathfrak{l}(\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)) - L^g(\gamma|_{[s,t]})| \leq K$ for all $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$. For $T > K$ set $\lambda := T - K$. Then we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}(k+1+r)(T-K) &\leq \sum L^g(\gamma|_{[t_i, t_i+\sigma_i]}) \\ &\leq L^g(\gamma|_{[t_1, t_k+\sigma_k]}) = (k+1)T + k(A+K).\end{aligned}$$

Solving for r shows

$$r \leq \frac{1}{T-K}((2k+1)K + kA).$$

Increasing T sufficiently we conclude the assertion. □

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of subsets of $\mathfrak{l}^{-1}(1)$ such that $W_{n+1} \subset cone(W_n)$. Assume further that there exists a sequence $\delta_n \downarrow 0$ such that for any k-tuple of pairwise different $v_i \in W_n$, $\mathfrak{l}(\sum v_i) \leq k + 1 + \delta_n$ holds. Then there exists a supporting hyperplane E of $\mathfrak{l}^{-1}(1)$ such that for any neighborhood U of $E \cap \mathfrak{l}^{-1}(1)$ the intersection $cone(W_n) \cap \mathfrak{l}^{-1}(1)$ is eventually contained in U.*

Proof. Let $\{v_0, \ldots, v_k\} \subset W_n$ and $t_0, \ldots, t_k \geq 0$ with $\sum t_i = 1$. Since $\mathfrak{l}(v_i) = 1$ we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}k + 1 + \delta_n \geq \mathfrak{l}(\sum v_i) &\geq \mathfrak{l}(\sum t_i v_i) + \sum \mathfrak{l}((1-t_i)v_i) \\ &= \mathfrak{l}(\sum t_i v_i) + \sum (1 - t_i) = \mathfrak{l}(\sum t_i v_i) + k.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathfrak{l}(\sum t_i v_i) \leq 1 + \delta_n$. By Caratheodory's theorem the convex hull of W_n is the union of all simplices with vertices in W_n. Consequently the closure of the convex hull of W_n is disjoint from $\mathfrak{l}^{-1}([1 + 2\delta_n, \infty))$. By the inverse triangle inequality, proposition 3.1 (ii) and the assumption $W_{n+1} \subset cone(W_n)$, the sets W_n are uniformly bounded. Then there exists an affine hyperplane E_n separating the convex hull of W_n from $\mathfrak{l}^{-1}([1 + 2\delta_n, \infty))$. Now consider a limit hyperplane E of $\{E_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Since $\lim \delta_n = 0$, E is a supporting hyperplane of $\mathfrak{l}^{-1}(1)$. The assertion now follows easily. □

Proof of theorem 4.1. It suffices to prove the assertion for parameter intervals of the form $[i2^n, (i+1)2^n]$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Set $W_n := \{\rho(\gamma|_{[i2^n,(i+1)2^n]}) \,|\, i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. By lemma 4.2 there exists a sequence $\delta_n \downarrow 0$ such that for all $\{v_0, \ldots, v_k\} \subset W_n$ $(k \leq m)$ holds $\mathfrak{l}(v_0 + \ldots v_k) \leq k + 1 + \delta_n$. Since any vector $\gamma((i+1)2^{n+1}) - \gamma(i2^{n+1})$ is the sum of two vectors of the form $\gamma((j+1)2^n) - \gamma(j2^n)$, the convex cone over W_n contains W_{n+1}. This establishes the assumptions of lemma 4.3 and therefore the assertion. □

Recall the definition of the dual cone $\mathfrak{T}^* := \{\alpha \in V^* \,|\, \alpha|_{\mathfrak{T}} \geq 0\}$ of $\mathfrak{T}$. We call a function $h \colon V \to \mathbb{R}$ α-equivariant, if

$$h(x + k) = h(x) + \alpha(k)$$

for all $x \in V$ and $k \in \Gamma$.

Remark 4.4. For $\alpha \in V^*$ there exists an α-equivariant time function if and only if $\alpha \in (\mathfrak{T}^*)^\circ$. Furthermore, the existence of an α-equivariant time function is equivalent to the existence of a smooth α-equivariant temporal function (a C^1-function is a temporal function if the Lorentzian gradient is always timelike and past pointing).

Let $\alpha \in V^*$ and $h\colon V \to \mathbb{R}$ be an α-equivariant C^1-function. Then the 1-form dh descends to a 1-form ω_h on V/Γ.

Definition 4.5. Let $\alpha \in (\mathfrak{T}^*)^\circ$ and $\tau\colon V \to \mathbb{R}$ be an α-equivariant temporal function.

(1) Define for $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\mathfrak{h}_\tau(\sigma) := \sup\{L^g(\gamma) |\ \gamma \text{ future pointing, } \int_\gamma \omega_\tau = \sigma\}$$

(2) A homologically maximizing curve $\gamma\colon I \to V/\Gamma$ is said to be α-almost maximal if there exists a constant $F < \infty$ such that

$$L^g(\gamma|_{[s,t]}) \geq \mathfrak{h}_\tau\left(\int_{\gamma|_{[s,t]}} \omega_\tau\right) - F$$

for all $s < t \in I$.

Remark 4.6. (i) Note that the definition of α-almost maximality does not depend on the choice of α-equivariant temporal function. A different choice of α-equivariant time function only yields a different constant F'.

(ii) In Riemannian geometry the notion of α-almost minimality (analogue of α-alomost maximality) is now replaced by the notions of calibrations and calibrated curves (compare [8]). The Lorentzian versions of calibrations and calibrated curves will be introduced in [1].

Define the dual stable time separation

$$\mathfrak{l}^*\colon \mathfrak{T}^* \to \mathbb{R},\ \alpha \mapsto \min\{\alpha(v) |\ \mathfrak{l}(v) = 1\}.$$

Theorem 4.7. (1) *For every $\alpha \in (\mathfrak{T}^*)^\circ$ there exists an α-almost maximal timelike geodesic $\gamma\colon \mathbb{R} \to V/\Gamma$.*

(2) *Let $\alpha \in \mathfrak{T}^*$ with $\mathfrak{l}^*(\alpha) = 1$. Then for every neighborhood U of $\alpha^{-1}(1) \cap \mathfrak{l}^{-1}(1)$ there exists a $K = K(\alpha, U) < \infty$ such that*

$$\rho(\gamma|_{[s,t]}) \in U$$

for all α-almost maximal future pointing curves $\gamma\colon \mathbb{R} \to V/\Gamma$ and every $s < t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\|\gamma(t) - \gamma(t)\| \geq K$.

Corollary 4.8. *$(V/\Gamma, g)$ contains infinitely many geometrically distinct homologically maximizing timelike geodesics $\gamma\colon \mathbb{R} \to V/\Gamma$ with the additional property that the limit*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \rho(\gamma|_{[s,s+t]}) =: v$$

exists uniformly in $s \in \mathbb{R}$. The v are exposed points of $\mathfrak{l}^{-1}(1)$.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $\alpha \in (\mathfrak{T}^*)^\circ$ and $\tau\colon V \to \mathbb{R}$ an α-equivariant time function.*

(i) Then there exists an $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\alpha) > 0$, such that

$$y - x \in \mathfrak{T}_\varepsilon$$

for all $x, y \in V$ with $y - x \in \mathfrak{T}$, $\tau(y) - \tau(x) \geq 2$ and $2d(x, y) \geq \mathfrak{h}_\tau(\tau(y) - \tau(x))$.

(ii) There exists a constant $I = I(\alpha) < \infty$ such that

$$\mathfrak{h}_\tau(\sigma_1) + \mathfrak{h}_\tau(\sigma_2) - I \leq \mathfrak{h}_\tau(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2) \leq \mathfrak{h}_\tau(\sigma_1) + \mathfrak{h}_\tau(\sigma_2)$$

for all $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \geq 0$.

(iii) We have

$$\lim_{\sigma\to\infty}\frac{\sigma}{\mathfrak{h}_\tau(\sigma)}=\mathfrak{l}^*(\alpha).$$

Proof. (i) Clear from the fact that τ is an α-equvariant time function and theorem 2.3.

(ii) The right side of the inequality is clear from the observation that any curve $\gamma\colon[a,b]\to V/\Gamma$ with $\int_\gamma\omega_\tau=\sigma_1+\sigma_2$ is the concatenation of two curves $\gamma_i\colon[a_i,b_i]\to V/\Gamma$ $(i=1,2)$ with $\int_{\gamma_i}\omega_\tau=\sigma_i$.

For the other inequality we reverse this procedure. Let $\gamma_i\colon[a_i,b_i]\to V/\Gamma$ be future pointing curves with $\int_{\gamma_i}\omega_\tau=\sigma_i$ $(i=1,2)$. Choose a future pointing curve ζ from $\gamma_1(b_1)$ to $\gamma_2(a_2)$ of $\|.\|$-arclength bounded by D. Then for sufficiently large σ_2 (the other cases can be absorbed into the constant I) there exists a $b_2'\in[a_2,b_2]$ with $\int_{\gamma_1*\zeta*\gamma_2|_{[a_2,b_2']}}\omega_\tau=\sigma_1+\sigma_2$. Using (i), the distance $\|\gamma_2(b_2)-\gamma_2(b_2')\|$ is uniformly bounded by some $I'(\alpha)<\infty$. The claim now follows by noting that $d(x,x+v)\leq\sup f|v|_1$.

(iii) Choose $v_\alpha\in\mathfrak{l}^{-1}(1)$ with $\alpha(v_\alpha)=1$. Then for all $x\in V$

$$\mathfrak{l}^*(\alpha)=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{n}{d(x,x+nv_\alpha)}\mathfrak{l}^*(\alpha)\geq\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{n\mathfrak{l}^*(\alpha)}{\mathfrak{h}_\tau(\tau(x+nv_\alpha)-\tau(x))}.$$

The difference $\tau(x+nv_\alpha)-\tau(x)-n\alpha(v_\alpha)$ is uniformly bounded. The continuity of $\mathfrak{h}_\tau$ and part (ii) then imply

$$\limsup_{\sigma\to\infty}\frac{\sigma}{\mathfrak{h}_\tau(\sigma)}\leq\mathfrak{l}^*(\alpha).$$

It remains to prove the opposite inequality

$$\liminf_{\sigma\to\infty}\frac{\sigma}{\mathfrak{h}_\tau(\sigma)}\geq\mathfrak{l}^*(\alpha).$$

By proposition 3.1, there exists a $K=K(\alpha)<\infty$ such that $\mathfrak{l}(\sigma v')\geq d(x,x+\sigma v')-K$ for all $\sigma\geq0$ and all $v'\in\mathfrak{l}^{-1}(1)\cap\alpha^{-1}(1)$. But then we have

$$\sigma\geq\mathfrak{l}^*(\alpha)\mathfrak{l}(\sigma v')\geq\mathfrak{l}^*(\alpha)\mathfrak{h}_\tau(\tau(x+\sigma v')-\tau(x)).$$

The claim now follows by noting again that the difference $\tau(x+nv')-\tau(x)-n\alpha(v')$ is uniformly bounded. □

Proof of theorem 4.7. (i) Let $\tau\colon V\to\mathbb{R}$ be an α-equivariant temporal function. Consider a sequence of homologically maximizing timelike pregeodesics $\gamma_n\colon[-T_n,T_n]\to V/\Gamma$ parameterized by $\|.\|$-arclength such that $\int_{\gamma_n}\omega_\tau=2n$ and $L^g(\gamma_n)=\mathfrak{h}_\tau(2n)$. The sequence T_n is obviously unbounded. The limit curve lemma implies that $\{\gamma_n\}$ contains a converging subsequence. Denote the limit curve by $\gamma\colon\mathbb{R}\to V/\Gamma$. The α-maximality of the γ_n imply that the γ_n are uniformly timelike. γ is therefore timelike as well. The homological maximality of γ follows from the homological maximality of the γ_n. γ is an α-almost maximal curve. Note that by lemma 4.9 (ii) for any interval $[a,b]\subset[-T_n,T_n]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}L^g(\gamma_n)&=L^g(\gamma_n|_{[-T_n,a]})+L^g(\gamma_n|_{[a,b]})+L^g(\gamma_n|_{[b,T_n]})=\mathfrak{h}_\tau(2n)\\&\geq\mathfrak{h}_\tau\left(\int_{\gamma_n|_{[-T_n,a]}}\omega_\tau\right)+\mathfrak{h}_\tau\left(\int_{\gamma_n|_{[a,b]}}\omega_\tau\right)+\mathfrak{h}_\tau\left(\int_{\gamma_n|_{[b,T_n]}}\omega_\tau\right)-2F.\end{aligned}$$

This implies already $L^g(\gamma|_{[a,b]})\geq\mathfrak{h}_\tau\left(\int_{\gamma_n|_{[a,b]}}\omega_\tau\right)-2F$.

(ii) The first step is to note that for all α-almost maximal curves γ and all α-equivariant temporal functions τ, the ratio

$$\frac{\int_{\gamma|_{[s,t]}} \omega_\tau}{L^g(\gamma|_{[s,t]})} \to 1 \tag{4.1}$$

for $\|\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)\| \to \infty$. Lemma 4.9 (iii) implies $\lim_{\sigma\to\infty} \frac{\sigma}{\mathfrak{h}_\tau(\sigma)} = 1$. Since γ is α-almost maximal, we conclude

$$\lim_{\|\gamma(t)-\gamma(s)\|\to\infty} \frac{\mathfrak{h}_\tau(\int_{\gamma|_{[s,t]}} \omega_\tau)}{L^g(\gamma|_{[s,t]})} = 1.$$

This implies (4.1).

By lemma 4.9 (i), there exists an $\varepsilon(\alpha) > 0$ such that for $\|\gamma(t)-\gamma(s)\|$ sufficiently large, $\gamma(t) - \gamma(s) \in \mathfrak{T}_{\varepsilon(\alpha)}$. But then

$$L^g(\gamma|_{[s,t]}) - K(\varepsilon) \leq \mathfrak{l}(\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)) \leq \alpha(\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)).$$

Now let U be a neighborhood of $\alpha^{-1}(1) \cap \mathfrak{l}^{-1}(1)$ and $\delta = \delta(U) > 0$ such that for all $h \in \mathfrak{l}^{-1}(1) \setminus U$, $\alpha(h) \geq 1 + \delta$. If $\rho(\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)) \notin U$, we get

$$\alpha(\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)) \geq (1 + \delta)\mathfrak{l}(\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)) \geq (1 + \delta)(L^g(\gamma|_{[s,t]}) - K(\varepsilon)).$$

If $\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)$ is not bounded from above, this contradicts the above conclusion: $\frac{\int_{\gamma|_{[s,t]}} \omega_\tau}{L^g(\gamma|_{[s,t]})} \to 1$ □

References

[1] S. Suhr, *Maximal geodesics in Lorentzian geometry*, Dissertation (in preparation), Freiburg, 2010.

[2] D. Yu. Burago, *Periodic metrics*, Representation theory and dynamical systems, Adv. Soviet Math., **9**, (1992), 205–210.

[3] V. Bangert, *Minimal geodesics*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems, **10**, (1990), 263–286.

[4] Beem, J. K., Ehrlich, P. E. and Easley, K. L., *Global Lorentzian geometry*. New York: Marcel Dekker Inc. (1996).

[5] A. Romero and M. Sánchez, *On completeness of certain families of semi-Riemannian manifolds*, Geom. Dedicata, **53**, (1994), 103–117.

[6] G. Galloway, and A. Horta, *Regularity of Lorentzian Busemann functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **348**, (1996), 2063–2084.

[7] J.-H. Eschenburg, *The splitting theorem for space-times with strong energy condition*, J. Differential Geom., **27**, (1988), 477–491.

[8] V. Bangert, *Minimal measures and minimizing closed normal one-currents*, Geom. Funct. Anal., **9**, (1999), 413–427.

Mathematisches Institut, Universität Freiburg
E-mail address: suhr100@googlemail.com